

**Modesto Junior College  
Planning & Budget Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 15, 2010**

**Present:**

Gaither Loewenstein, Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)  
Mike Adams, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)  
Kevin Alavezos, Academic Senate appointee  
Jim Clarke, Technology/Distance Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)  
Paul Cripe, Academic Senate appointee  
Lori Dangerfield, CSEA appointee  
Rosanne Faughn, CSEA appointee  
Kenneth Hart, Director of Research and Planning (ex-officio)  
Rose LaMont, YFA Budget Analyst  
Maurice McKinnon, Instructional Dean  
Bob Nadell, Vice President of Student Services  
Martha Robles, Student Services Administrator  
Karen Walters Dunlap, Vice President of Instruction  
David Ward, YFA appointee  
Robin Jones, ASMJC Student Rep

**Absent:**

Iris Carroll, Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee  
Jane Chawinga, YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)  
Dale Pollard, Faculty Career Technical Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)  
Gary Whitfield, Vice President of College Administrative Services

**Guest:**

Jenni Abbott

**Business**

**1. Review of Minutes**

**Action Item**

There was no objection to the minutes of October 1, 2010.

**2. Review of Agenda**

Mike Adams reviewed the agenda with members.

### **3. Administrative Planning Council Reporting Ranking Criteria for Resource Requests**

#### ***Administrative Council***

Administrative Council reporting was tabled until the next meeting as Gary Whitfield was not in attendance.

#### ***Instructional Administrators Council***

Karen Walters Dunlap reported that the Instructional Administrators Council met last Thursday and reviewed criteria and is in the process of reviewing and ranking requests. Another meeting is scheduled to review the results. There were nine presentations. Lists will be reviewed this coming Monday and recommendations forwarded to this body by the end of the week.

Gaither Loewenstein interjected that PBC will be receiving a list of 93 faculty positions and 85 classified positions. He clarified that everything has to be included on a list because we never know what other opportunities like grants and new money will come to the college. A list of needs is also needed to see how everything fits. Most community colleges just look at new money and that is all that is considered. He added that what is never done, is ask about the other money we are already spending. The college asks the question *is everything we are doing now more important than the most important thing on the priority list that we are not already doing?* He asked if it makes sense to look at the base, adding that these are shared governance questions. Gaither requested that members go back to their constituent groups and ask if we should go back to the base and look at it. If not, then we are saying that everything we are now doing is more important than anything we are not now doing regardless of its place on the priority list.

Rose LaMont pointed out that no one says that their program is not valuable. Maurice McKinnon added that if a program has proven to be non-viable (not enough students) then other colleges train their faculty for other programs. Gaither reminded members that ultimately, this is the body that is going to be making recommendations on matters regarding budget priorities.

Kevin Alavezos stated that program review information would be valuable to look at and not reinventing the wheel. Gaither stated that he believes that we already have the data with program review and enrollment data and we know what classes fill. He added that he will be looking at vacant positions that have not been replaced as well in determining staffing decisions.

All lists from the councils were requested to come to the President by October 29<sup>th</sup>. The November 5<sup>th</sup> PBC meeting will be dedicated to a hearing with the college community invited to come and participate in the hearing. Following the hearing each PBC member will have two weeks to look at the list, review data, and contact people. Karen Walters Dunlap added that all program review information will be on SharePoint for reference. IAC recommends that the hearing be live streamed so staff can listen in on their desktop. Gaither requested that members study the lists for the hearing to see if they make sense to them. After the hearing

members will bring the same lists back and positions can be moved around at that time, if warranted based on hearing testimony, members' review of data and deliberations of the Committee.

#### **4. Review of District Strategic Plan - Revisit**

Mike Adams reviewed what was recommended at the last meeting. The district meeting to review their strategic plan is in November and they have asked the Planning & Budget Committee for input. Gaither added that PBC members on District Council will be bringing these suggestions up at the meeting.

#### **Suggestions:**

Jenni Abbott felt: Energy should be a separate goal. Communication should be something that is considered as an objective under institutional effectiveness. Multiple methods of communicating, i.e. email, poster. Professional development for every employee (#4 Quality Staff). It would be nice to see a focus on that, investing in employees. What our role in community is (#6 Community Leadership). Think we should look at it more as community service and how we would do things differently all across the board. Doesn't say how we are serving community. With some models you have a goal, several objectives that match that goal and then you have activities and timelines. Jenni distributed an example from another institution.

Gaither stated that for the facilities goal, he would like to suggest adding the concept of total cost of ownership (insert #9.2 Facilities). Utility and staffing costs are going to go through the roof and need to be accounted for.

Jim Clarke added that there is a total cost of ownership in technology. Gaither suggested adding to #5.1 (Technology), and develop and implement long range plan for staff development.

Jenni Abbott stated that under Quality Staff (#4) "encouraging" needs to be strongly there. Being environmentally responsible is critical for the district and should be a separate goal like adding an additional goal #11. It is big and can be buried in a lot of goals.

Gaither stated that partnerships is not a goal in itself but rather a strategy and that it is not worthy of a stand-alone goal.

Martha Robles stated that #1 (Student Success and Access) is not really a goal. What is student success? Everything related should be student success. Access should not be combined with student success as a goal.

Jenni Abbott suggested that goals 1 & 2 (Student Success and Access/Educational Programs and Services) could be incorporated under instructional effectiveness. Gaither added that the district needs to talk about if it is a plan for the district or Central Services. Central Services should be support and to get services out to the colleges.

Ken Hart added that it is a luxury to have a ten year plan and it should probably be a five year plan and reviewed yearly. Gaither responded that usually the strategic plans have a five-year time period and are revised somewhere near the midpoint.

Jim Clarke referenced Foothill-De Anza's strategic plan which states that it follows the district plan and is comprised of three *District Commitments*: student success and achievement, student access, and stewardship of resources. The college also has long range goals for sustainability and they have a target date.

Foothill-De Anza's website was brought up on screen for members to view and discuss their strategic plan which follows, in part.

**Foothill-De Anza's guiding principles** in planning approach are to:

- **Engage** all stakeholders during the process
- **Integrate** strategic and operational planning
- **Implement** plans with a passion for success
- **Align** resources to priority commitments
- **Measure** success in achieving commitments and strategies

**Success Metrics** to measure progress in achieving each District Commitment

- Metrics should be relatively few in number – less than 12 overall
- Metrics should be in use today or are ones that can be implemented in a relatively straightforward way
- Metrics should be consistent with the intent of each of the District Commitments

**District Commitments** and associated metrics are described in a rubric with the following three headings. District Commitments are closely aligned with the strategies developed at each college and are consistent with the district's prior strategic plans. Metrics are reviewed on an annual basis.

**Goal:**

*What we expect*

**Metric:**

*How we'll measure it*

**Target:**

*What we are aiming for*

Mike Adams will speak with the Chancellor to determine how she wants to proceed. Paul Cripe asked if a minor revision of the district's strategic plan could take place now and a major revision follow.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Robin Jones distributed flyers for ASMJC's Halloween party which is targeted for all age groups to participate.

Rosanne Faughn introduced Lori Dangerfield who is the new classified representative on the Planning & Budget Committee.

## **FUTURE AGENDA**

1. Hiring Priority Hearing – November 5

## **ADJOURNMENT**